

REMARKS

The Final Office Action of August 24, 2006 has been reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 8 and 16 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Preliminarily, Applicants would like to thank the Examiner and his supervisor, Karl Easthom, for the courtesies extended to their representative during the Examiner Interview of October 18, 2006. The following remarks include Applicants' substance of interview pursuant to MPEP § 713.04.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0145342 to Lyon ("Lyon"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Amended claim 8 recites an apparatus configured for receiving inductive energy, comprising, among other features, a coil *configured to alternate between an energized state and a de-energized state at regular intervals in a polling mode* and configured for receiving the inductive energy and for receiving an inductive data communication. Lyon fails to teach or suggest such a feature.

Lyon describes a method and apparatus used for adaptive inductive charging of a device. Abstract. The device used with the system includes a secondary coil over which a communication port can communicate charge information and status. Para. 0024. Lyon fails to teach or suggest a pick up coil configured to alternate between an energized state and a de-energized state at regular intervals in a polling mode. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 8 is allowable.

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,455,466 to Parks et al. ("Parks"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Parks describes a system for inductively coupling power and data to a portable electronic device. Abstract. The system includes a primary winding and a secondary winding that are inductively coupled when properly aligned. Col. 4, lines 15-17. The primary winding induces corresponding signals of identical frequency in the secondary winding. The signals induced in

the secondary winding are demodulated by the modem and then are input to the microprocessor for processing. Col. 4, lines 27-35. Parks fails to teach or suggest a coil configured to alternate between an energized state and a de-energized state at regular intervals in a polling mode. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 8 is allowable.

Claims 9-15 and 28-31 depend from claim 8 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed above and further in view of the novel features recited therein. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 9, 12, 13 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parks in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,275,143 to Stobbe (“Stobbe”). Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parks in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,963,012 to Garcia et al. (“Garcia”). Claims 28-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lyon in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0159434 to Gosier et al. (“Gosier”). Claims 9, 12-15 and 28-31 depend from claim 8 and are allowable for the reasons discussed above. The addition of Stobbe, Garcia and Gosier fails to cure the deficiencies of Lyon and Parks. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections.

Claims 16, 17 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garcia in view of Gosier and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,734,254 to Stephens (“Stephens”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

When evaluating patentability under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), all claim features must be considered, especially when they are missing from the prior art. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988) (Federal Circuit held a reference did not render the claimed combination obvious because the examiner ignored a claimed feature that was absent from the reference). Amended claim 16 recites a computer implemented method of providing inductive energy to a battery charger assembly, comprising, among other steps, displaying an object on a graphical user interface indicative of the step of receiving and indicating a type of power being received. None of Garcia, Gosier or Stephens, alone or in combination, teach or suggest such a feature. For example, none of Garcia, Gosier, or Stephens teach or suggest displaying an object on a

graphical user interface. Further, none of the references cited teach or suggest displaying an object on a graphical user interface indicative of the step of receiving and indicating a type of power being received. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 16 is allowable.

Claims 17-21 depend from claim 16 and are allowable for at least the same reason as discussed above and further in view of the novel features recited therein. The addition of Stobbe, Parks, and U.S. Patent No. 6,291,966 to Wendelrup et al. ("Wendelrup") fails to cure the deficiencies of Garcia, Gosier and Stephens. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections.

CONCLUSION

If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: October 24, 2006

By: /Elizabeth A. Almeter/
Elizabeth A. Almeter
Registration No. 57,019

1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001